DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 406 CS 503 825

AUTHOR Osmunson, Stanley E.; Miller, Larry D.
TITLE Can We Teach Reframing? An Empirical Test of a Communication Problem Solving Skill.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (32nd, Boston, MA, May 2-5, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Behavior Patterns; College Students; *Communication Problems; *Communication Research; *Communication Skills; Females; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Competence; Males; *Problem Solving; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Interpersonal Communication

ABSTRACT

Reframing, (redirecting or changing the perceptual experience of a situation by placing it in another frame that fits the facts equally well or better) is a relatively unique approach to interpersonal problem solving. A study was conducted to determine whether reframing could be taught as a self-help interpersonal problem-solving skill and to explore whether the sex of the subject would influence the ability to reframe. Subjects were 73 college students who were selected on the basis of their demonstrated inability to reframe. They were placed into either an experimental group that received training in reframing or a control group that received no training. Both groups completed a Double Bind Game posttest. The results indicated that reframing can be taught as a self-help skill and that sex did not influence an individual's ability to reframe interpersonal problem situations. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216406

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Can We Teach Reframing? An Empirical Test of a Communication Problem Solving Skill

by

Stanley E. Osmunson
Effective Relationships Counseling
Walnut Creek, CA

and

Larry D. Miller
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Stanley E. Osmunson
Larry D. Miller
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This research had two main objectives: to determine whether or not reframing or set breaking can be taught as a self-help interpersonal problem solving skill and to explore whether or not sex has any influence on an individual's ability to reframe. Three hypotheses were posited: (1) Individuals who receive reframing training will demonstrate significantly improved reframing ability in comparison with individuals who receive no reframing training. (2) Males who receive either reframing training or no training will not exhibit significantly different reframing ability than females who receive either reframing training or no training. (3) There will be no significant interaction effect between training and sex. Participants were selected on the basis of their demonstrated inability to reframe. An experimental group received training in reframing and then completed a Double Bind Game posttest. A control group received no training and completed the same posttest. The results of this study suggest that reframing can be taught as a self-help skill and that sex does not influence individual ability to reframe interpersonal problem situations.

Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, May 1-5, 1982 Boston, Massachusetts

CS503825

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
The cost of printing this publication was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.

REFRAMING: AN EMPIRICAL TEST

> Perhaps therapy is not necessary! What we may need is direct training or education in the conditions of good human relations. (Patterson & Carkhuff, 1969, p. ix)

Interactions which incite human problems are frequently those which bind individuals to limiting alternatives. The extent to which an individual "problem solves" or "successfully escapes" limiting or binding interactions is to a large degree a function of his/her ability to redirect or change the communication. Consider, for example, the mother who asks her six-year old son whether he would like peas or lima beans with supper. Implicit in this communication structure is the frame: you will have a green vegetable with supper. From the child's perspective the context is limiting in that a choice between perhaps two equally undesirable alternatives is presumably forced. To accept the frame will necessitate one of two responses, peas or lima beans. Yet, the more experienced, if not creative, child may reject the implicit frame by saying such things as "I don't want a vegetable," or, "I'd rather have applesauce." These two alternatives hold very different implications, but both entail a kind of "set breaking" or "reframing" of the implicit dimensions of the mother's message such that the child's problem is solved.

Problem solving is an ability individuals must acquire in order to survive and prosper in a social world. Sometimes, people are overwhelmed by their problems and seek professional help. In the past,

help took the form of administering a "cure" to the "patient." Today, the challenge is not just to "cure" the "symptoms," but to teach methods of self help. People who seek professional help are not simply overwhelmed by problems, but often they have exhausted their reserves of self-help strategies. Recognizing this exhausted state and the fact that there are not enough helping professionals to meet demands for services (Miller, 1969), it becomes apparent that teaching personal and interpersonal skills to help solve problems is necessary (Authier, 1977; Authier, Gustafson, Guerney, & Kasdorf, 1975; Guerney, 1977, 1979).

One relatively unique approach to interpersonal problem solving is reframing. Technically speaking, to reframe means to redirect or change the perceptual experience of a situation by placing it in another frame which fits the "facts" equally well or even better. Reframing changes the meaning attributed to the situation and therefore its consequences, but not its concrete facts. The results are change while the situation itself may remain unchanged and even unchangeable (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). Consider, for example, Mark Twain's Tom Sawyer. At one point Tom is ordered to whitewash a large board fence by his Aunt. Tom senses the problem. Not only will he be unable to go swimming with his peers, but he will be the object of their ridicule for having to spend his time "working." If he does go swimming, and not complete the assigned task, he will suffer the wrath of his Aunt. By reframing the act of whitewashing the fence into a rare fun-filled and creative enterprise, Tom soon reaps a profit from his friends who pay for the privilege of painting the fence. In short, he has reframed the salient definition of reality such that what was perceived as drudgery now becomes pleasure

(Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). Essentially, reframing allows an individual to perceive alternatives.

While the term "reframing" refers to a very precise perceptual phenomenon, it is suggestive of a variety of set breaking phenomena or quasi-reframes. As employed here reframing is generally construed to refer to set breaking communications, that is, responses that go outside the implicit frame of the initial message. Thus, the child in the peas or lima beans example broke set by rejecting the implicit limitations advanced by the mother. Tom Sawyer reframed in a more formal and technically correct sense. The focus of this study is on increasing response alternatives. Increasing the available alternatives is one avenue to problem solving (D'Zurilla & Goldfried, 1971).

In order to understand how reframing and its variant forms operate, we must first consider some assumptions about how human beings organize experience and consequently perceive reality. Humans continually strive to understand direct stimulus experience or "objective reality." We do this by grouping things into concepts which we label, for example, people, animals, light, rain, rocks, cold, love, peace, hate, and anger. As a result of our conceptual groupings, we create new realities once removed from the actual stimulus experience, that is meta-realities, or realities one level removed from the actual facts. Eventually these meta-realities become "things" in their own right and are experienced as part of the "objective reality" (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). In other words, we have the capacity to "create" realities then "forget" that they are our own creation; eventually we experience them as if they contained the power of "objective reality."

Given that we continually strive to understand our environment and ourselves, we are constantly driven to create new realities until what we interact with are rarely the "things" per se, that is their basic properties or even what is simply observable. Rather, "objective reality" becomes a series of conceptual groupings or meta-realities based on our values, meanings or opinions which we collectively attribute to the "things" in question. Consequently, what becomes real, simplistically speaking, is that which is agreed upon by a number of people (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). Reframing operates within the realm of meta-realities, by playing with our contrived categories of "objective reality," and by manipulating our artificial classifications and membership systems until change takes place in meta-reality even if "objective reality" cannot change.

Historically, reframing was preceded by several variant forms of the phenomenon. Negative practice (Dunlap, 1928, 1942), paradoxical intention (Frankel, 1960), direct analysis (Rosen, 1953), symptom prescription (Jackson & Weakland, 1961; Jackson, 1962; and Haley, 1963), therapeutic doublebind (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1976; Erickson & Rossi, 1975) and relabeling, symptom redefinition, and positive interpretation (Feldman, 1976) have enjoyed extensive clinical support as successful problem solving strategies.

Typically, a therapist intervenes into the life reality of someone experiencing a problem and once "cured" the client goes on his or her way. Different people, of course, respond differently to essentially the same message. Some people are simply better at coping with potentially problematic messages. Consider, for example, the situation when

one spouse yells at another. The recipient of the message may "frame" the yelling behavior as evidence that his or her spouse "has been working too hard." Consequently, the verbal abuse is not taken too seriously or personally. A different spouse, however, might interpret the identical verbal abuse as evidence that "he or she finds me offensive." In the latter instance, the interpretation gives rise to a potential problem that may require external assistance (therapy) while the former does not. The point is that whether or not some interaction becomes problematic and requires external assistance or is successfully negotiated without aid is in some measure contingent upon an individual's propensity to respond in ways that are creative and set breaking.

Pettegrew (1979) found that untrained individuals demonstrate varying degrees of set breaking or reframing ability.[1] Adkins (1973), Authier (1977), Authier et al. (1979), Brown (1979, 1980), Carkhuff (1971), Glasgow and Rosen (1978), Guerney (1977), Ivey (1973, 1974), Pierce and Drasgow (1969), Schinke, Gilchrest, Smith, and Wong (1979), and Vitalo (1971) report that interpersonal skills can be learned and/or improved through a process of skills training or psychoeducation. The primary purpose of this study, therefore, was to determine whether or not reframing or set breaking can be taught to individuals as a potential self-help problem solving skill. A secondary purpose was to explore the influence of sex on reframing ability. Prior research in the area of problem solving suggests that sex may influence the application of reframing strategies to a problem situation (Luchin, 1942; Guetzkow, 1951; Nakamura, 1958). More recent studies (Gold & Berger, 1978; and Berger & Gold, 1979), however, provide evidence for the opposite

conclusion, that is, sex has no impact on problem solving ability. Three hypotheses were posited:

I. Individuals who receive reframing training will demonstrate significantly improved reframing ability in comparison with individuals who receive no reframing training.

II. Males who receive either reframing training or no training will not exhibit significantly different reframing ability than females who receive either reframing training or no training.

III. There will be no significant interaction effect between training and sex.

Research Design

This study utilized a 2 x 2 factorial design with two levels of reframing training and two levels of sex. Reframing training was manipulated by randomly assigning male and female participants to either a treatment or control group. The dependent variable is the participants' responses to a series of Double Bind Games (DBG). Essentially, the DBG serve as paper and pencil stimuli which place participants in an untenable, by hypothetical, interaction requiring a response. Responses are judged by raters and classified for reframing qualities, if any. Developing a stimulus measure of reframing ability was a major component of the pre-experimental dimensions of this study.

Instrumentation

Pettegrew (1979) developed an instrument to stimulate and measure reframing ability. Drawing upon the work of Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1967), Pettegrew examined the phenomenon of "paradoxical communication" and posited that the use of paradoxical communication in an

interpersonal relationship produces an "untenable interaction," i.e., the individual initiating a paradoxical communication binds the other to a "damned if you do, damned if you don't" situation. The creation of untenable interactions is one way for a message sender to establish power over a receiver and consequently influence, if not control, his/her behavior. Presumably, a competent social interactant can recognize and correctly identify paradoxical communications and thereby minimize their effects.

Pettegrew (1979) developed two games, the Zen Master and Love Affair, which involve participants in an untenable interaction with a significant other. After reading or listening to the vignette, participants respond and their responses are evaluated for reframing strategies, if any. Pettegrew's games were developed on the basis of the Double Bind Theory of Schizophrenia (Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1976; Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967), as were the additional games developed for this research. Eight Double Bind Games were split into two groups. The pretest group was designed to identify individuals who do not reframe and included the Zen Master, College, Mother-in-Law, and Lovers games. The posttest group served to assess the effects of training, if any. The posttest group included Divorced, Coin Toss, Reunion, and Judged.[2] The "College" vignette illustrates the stimulus measures.

COLLEGE

You are ready to depart for your first year at the university. You have just finished packing the last few items of clothing and your father has put most of the other things you will need

in the car. You have decided to take a train to school. You felt it would be much better than having your parents drive you the seven hours to the university. Besides, you knew you would need time to be by yourself before you began this new stage of your life. The train will be arriving in about an hour from now and you and your family will drive the car to the train station. Finally, the moment has arrived. The train is ready to depart. Your baggage has been checked in and your family is tearfully saying their good-byes. As you are about to go through the gate to board the train your father says to you, "Now I don't want you coming back from college with a lot of ideas!"

Write down briefly what you would say and/or do in response to your father's statement.

The vignette creates a hypothetical situation wherein the father's statement entails binding and limited alternatives for the college bound youth. The message is framed to bind the child such that he/she either (A) prepares to reject the new ideas that usually derive from a college education and in so doing presumably maintains the relationship with the father or (B) seeks the new ideas and thereby endangers the relationship with the father. Table 1 presents several illustrative responses that reflect different abilities to respond in creative, set breaking ways.

Validity, Reliability, and Equivalency of the DBG

In developing the DBG it was necessary to determine their validity, reliability and equivalency. Six graduate students in Guidance and

Counseling were retained to evalute the games. Validity was assessed in two ways: criterion related and concurrent. Criterion related validity was assessed by having the six evaluators independently determine whether or not the several games met the Bateson et al. (1976) double bind criteria. Essentially, (1) two people are presumed to be involved in an intense relationship with a high degree of survival for at least one of them, (2) a message is advanced by the sender which is so structured that it binds the receiver, and (3) the message recipient is prevented from stepping outside the frame implied by the message, consequently, the recipient has difficulty responding to the binding injunction appropriately.

The six raters independently evaluated each game for the presence of the three criteria. Criterion related validity coefficients across raters and games ranged from .834 to 1.00 with an average coefficient of .926. All eight games were judged valid.

Using the Zen Master game, Pettegrew (1979) found that twenty-four percent of his undergraduate sample (N=200) failed to reframe. In this study twenty-seven percent of the sample (N=385) failed to reframe the Zen Master game while thirty-one percent of the sample tended not to reframe the four pretest games.[3] Only individuals who tended <u>not</u> to reframe were included in the actual experiment. Thus, there is evidence that the DBG have concurrent validity.

Two estimates of interrater reliability were computed. The ratio of coding agreements to the total number of coding decisions was .97 (Holsti, 1969, p. 140). Additionally, Scott's Pi (1955), a more conservative procedure which takes chance agreement into account, was

determined to be .93. The evidence indicates that the judges' evaluations are reliable.

While the determination of validity and reliability is vital to establishing the credibility of the DBG as stimulus measures to elicit participant responses, it is equally important to determine whether or not the several different games are roughly equivalent to one another with respect to their double binding qualities. Consequently, an equivalency test was conducted. Each of the raters scored the games on a scale from one to ten with one being the least double binding and ten the most double binding. Scores range from 6.0 to 9.5 with an overall mean of 7.54. A simple analysis of variance was executed to determine whether or not the ratings were significantly different from one another. No significant difference was detected ($F = 1.63$, $df = 8,45$, $p < .14$, $1-\beta = .32$, effect size = .5).[4] While failure to attain statistical significance does not establish that the games are necessarily equivalent, the results are compatible with an hypothesis of equivalence. Overall, the DBG were determined to be valid, reliable, and more or less equivalent stimulus measures.

Scoring Procedures and Rater Training

The scheme of strategies or response categories developed by Pettegrew (1979) was modified for use in this study. There are six kinds of response options identified respectively as strategy #0 through strategy #5. Each strategy carries an assigned value or weight such that the closer one comes to complete reframe (Strategy #4), the higher the score. Thus, a person could receive a score ranging between zero and four for his or her response to any particular vignette or a composite

score range from zero to sixteen for the four game pretest set (or post-test set). Table 1 identifies and briefly defines the strategies and their corresponding values.

Table 1 about here

Three of the six raters who evaluated the double bind games with regard to validity, reliability and equivalency also screened the 385 Phase I particiants' pretest responses and subsequently rated the post-test responses of the 73 Phase II subjects. Raters were trained in two stages over a ten day period. Initial training involved three two-hour sessions during which raters read explanatory materials from a training packet about reframing, discussed the concept of reframing with the primary researcher and one another, and participated in a double bind game. The raters were instructed in the strategy/scoring procedures (as per Table 1), practiced scoring responses and discussed their judgments in detail. Stage II of the training consisted of another two-hour session during which raters evaluated freshly generated sample materials. Inter-rater reliability in scoring sample responses was .96. Raters rated blind, i.e., they were not advised as to which responses were being rated (experimental or control group).

Participants

Of the 385 undergraduate students who voluntarily participated in Phase I of this study (completing the four DBG pretest), seventy-three participants, thirty-two males and forty-one females, were selected to participate in the actual experiment (Phase II). Each participant was selected by virtue of his/her demonstrated inability to reframe. Monetary

compensation was provided for participation. The number of participants was sufficient to provide a solid test of the hypotheses (Kirk, 1968, p. 173).

Experimental Procedures

Individuals who received an average reframing score of six or less on the DBG pretest were operationally defined as low level reframers. Seventy-three participants (32 males and 41 females) were randomly assigned to either the experimental or control group. Sixteen males and twenty-one females constituted the experimental group. These individuals were scheduled into one of four training sessions. Each participant received a training packet consisting of: (1) the four pretest DBG, (2) an explanation of reframing and its importance as a self-help problem solving strategy, and (3) a table that explained various strategies individuals may use when confronted with an untenable interaction. The primary researcher led a ninety minute didactic, experientially oriented training session. The number of participants per session ranged from seven to twelve. Several sessions with reduced number of trainees were held, as opposed to one large training session, in an effort to promote individual participation, attentiveness, and learning. Following training sessions, the respondents completed the DBG posttest--a series of four vignettes which they had not previously experienced.

The control group consisted of sixteen males and twenty females. These individuals were not trained. Rather, approximately one week following the pretest they completed the DBG posttest. The raters scored all responses for reframing qualities. Respondents' scores were then analyzed to test the several hypotheses.

Statistical Analyses

Table 2 provides a summary of the pretest and posttest raw score means, mean differences, and standard deviations for the independent variables.

Table 2 about here

As the pretest has the potential to influence posttest scores, a simple bivariate regression was executed to assess the impact of the pretest on the posttest. Although positive, the relationship was weak ($r = .019$). The linear association between the pre- and posttest was not statistically significant ($F = .025$, $df = 1,72$, $p < .87$).

The information yielded by the regression analysis was employed to calculate residualized gain scores. Residualized gain scores are calculated by predicting posttest scores from the pretest scores on the basis of the correlation between the pretest and posttest and then subtracting the predicted posttest scores from the actual posttest scores. In short, residualization involves the difference between an observed X_2 (posttest) and that predicted $\hat{X}_2$ (predicted posttest) by least squares procedures from X_1 (pretest).[5] Through residualization, posttest scores are purged of pretest influence (Bohrnstedt, 1969). Although the impact of the pretest on the posttest was not significant, the posttest scores were purified nonetheless. Table 3 provides a summary of the residualized gain score means and standard deviations.

Table 3 about here

The residualized data was analyzed by two way analysis of variance. Reframing training had an impact on the experimental outcome. Trained participants demonstrated significantly improved reframing ability in comparison with those who were not trained ($F = 72.20$, $df = 1,69$, $p < .01$). Thus, hypothesis 1 is retained. The analysis also revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in reframing ability between males and females in either the trained or non-trained condition ($F = 2.81$, $df = 1,69$, $p < .098$, $1-\beta = .42$, effect size = .32). The F ratio, however, does approach significance and therefore is of some interest. In order to "get at" the question of whether or not sex influences reframing ability, an exploratory one way analysis of variance of the original participant pool's ($N = 385$) responses to the pretest DBG was conducted. There was no significant difference between males and females ($F = 1.40$, $df = 1,383$, $p < .273$). Overall, the evidence indicates that the ability to reframe and the acquisition of reframing skill through training is not a function of, nor is it influenced by sex. Finally, the interaction effect between the two independent variables, training and sex, was also tested. There was no significant interaction effect ($F = 1.20$, $df = 1,69$, $p < .276$).

Discussion

This study constitutes an initial step toward the development of a self-help program designed to teach reframing, a strategy for resolving interpersonal communication problems. Self-help programs are, of course, not new or unique (Authier, 1977; Authier & Fix, 1977; Authier, Gustafson, Guerney, & Kasdorf, 1975) and neither are variant forms of reframing (Mozdzierz, Macchitelli, & Lisiecki, 1976; Dunlap, 1928;

Frankl, 1975). What is new, however, is the current conceptualization, definition, and application of reframing (Pettegrew, 1979; Watzlawick, 1978; Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967; Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974); and what is unique, moreover, is the empirical test of reframing reported in this study. Essentially, an effort was made to teach reframing to individuals who lacked this skill and then measure the effects of that training as participants attempted to reframe simulated interpersonal communication problem situations. Analysis of the data employed to test the first hypothesis indicates that trained respondents are able to redirect or change the perceptual problems presented to them by placing the problems in another frame. In other words, respondents were able to break the implicit set and in a sense reframe consequences of the binding communication.

Confirmation of the first hypothesis demonstrates that a communication technique, heretofore used in settings where the change agent was external to the person in need, can be taught directly as a self-help skill. Transference of change mechanisms from the "helper" to the "helpee" is significant because it shifts the responsibility for change and "health" back to the individual. This responsibility has been and still is a very basic element in all theories of psychological assistance, but an element, unfortunately, that is all too often theoretical rather than pragmatic. Retention of the second hypothesis suggests that sex has no influence on the ability to reframe interpersonal problem situations, nor does it have an influence on the participants' ability to learn how to reframe. Retention of the third hypothesis indicates that

there are no interactive effects between training and sex and an individual's ability to reframe.

From a theoretical perspective this study provides support for the Interactionists' position that reframing is a powerful tool of change (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). The Interactionists assert that reframing allows the individual to perceive a problem as existing in a variety of alternative class memberships or meta-realities. Moreover, as reframing frees the individual to "see" his/her problem in a different light or from a different meta-reality, he/she consequently avoids being trapped in the anguish of his/her former view (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974). Through reframing, the reality of a binding situation can be adjusted. By assigning new meaning, an individual is able to perceive alternatives and possible new solutions. Those who were taught to reframe were successful in producing change; a perceptual change which facilitates more creative and effective communication responses.

In the practical application of change mechanisms, Whiting (1976) addresses some fundamental considerations. Historically, the utilization of change techniques has, in fact, been limited by the audience to which they were applied. In other words, people are presumed to be capable of changing only to the extent to which an external condition is changed or an "external change agent" activates latent alternative behaviors. Consistent with Galois' Mathematical Group theory (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974) and the "principle limiting corollary of change" (Whiting, 1976) people <u>cannot</u> change because they have constructed a "conceptual/perceptual frame" <u>within which</u> they attempt

to solve confronting problems. Thus, solutions which are derived from this conceptual/perceptual frame, consistently produce similar limited action (more of the same).

Traditionally, psychotherapy has attempted, via an external change agent, to modify or reconstruct "characteristics" of an individual within his/her perceptual frame. Consonant with the ideas presented by Watzlawick, et al. (1974), but contrary to traditional psychotherapy, Whiting proposes that change can take place, and take place more rapidly, by changing the individual's conceptual/perceptual frame, rather than attempting to change reality characteristics within the frame. Consistent with Whiting's proposal, the findings of this study suggest individuals can be "reframed." In addition, and contrary to Whiting's position, this study also suggests that individuals can be taught to break set and to an extent reframe themselves.

A practical extension of this study, therefore, would be to utilize the training materials to teach individuals reframing skills, that is, how to deal more effectively with life's problems. By adding the element of role playing and increasing the time spent in practice and discussion, participants would be insured of increased retention and enhance skill dexterity in working with the reframing materials. The material could also be used in training mental health practitioners, who might, in turn, instruct their clients.

By adapting the training materials, practitioners could become thoroughly grounded in both reframing theory and application and help to tailor reframing materials to the needs of their clients. The instructional mode could be extended, following the precedent set by the

psychoeducationists, into schools and educational systems. As Authier (1977) has pointed out, the beauty of a psychoeducational approach to minimize psychological problems and maximize successful living is that utilization is only limited by imagination.

Directions for Future Research

This study reports two major findings: (1) individuals who are taught reframing skills are able to break set and change the meaning and the consequences of a binding communication and (2) sex does not influence reframing ability as it "naturally" exists nor the acquisition of reframing skills through training. These findings have given rise to several ideas for practical training extensions. In order for those ideas to come to fruition, however, further research is needed. Based on what is known as a result of this study, there are several questions which need to be addressed. First, is ninety minutes of training sufficient exposure for reframing techniques to be learned and that knowledge successfully transferred to real life situations? Second, can a training program be devised such that it is capable of closely (or more closely) approximating the emotional intensity of a "real" binding encounter? Finally, and perhaps most importantly, how permanent and transferable is the training effect? Will it last three months, six months, a year, or more? These are the questions which subsequent research will need to explore if reframing is to become a fully viable and widely utilized technique for resolving interpersonal communication problems.

Table 1

Strategies and Corresponding Values

(with sample responses to the BDG "College")

Strategy		Value	Example
#0	Response is not explicit or descriptive of his/her actions.	0	He's probably worried about my leaving and therefore may not mean exactly what he says.
#1	Response indicates that s/he accepted the limited frame of alternatives presented by the injunction and knowingly suffers the consequences.	1	I will try not to, Dad.
#2	Response indicates that s/he accepts the frame of alternatives presented by the injunction, but reframes the consequences.	2	Oh no, Father, I wouldn't think of it; college is for finding better jobs.
#3	Response indicates that s/he avoids making a choice of alternatives presented by the injunction.	2	What do you think I should do at college, Father?
#4	Response indicates that s/he reframes the alternatives presented by the injunction and knowingly continues the relationship.	4	Don't worry, Dad, I will learn only those things which will enhance my life. I will still be the same and I will still love you.
#5	Response indicates that s/he reframes the alternatives presented by the injunction and knowingly reframes the consequences.	3	Dad, there is no need to go to college if I'm not going to learn new ideas.

Table 2

Summary Table of Pretest and Posttest Raw Score Means, Mean Differences, and Standard Deviations for Training and Sex

Source	Mean	Mean Diff.	% Increase	Std. Dev.	N
Reframing Training					
Training					
Pretest	4.68	7.05	44	1.29	37
Posttest	11.73			2.92	37
Non-Training					
Pretest	4.89	1.44	9	1.45	36
Posttest	6.33			2.44	36
Sex					
Male					
Pretest	4.75	3.69	23	1.46	32
Posttest	8.44			3.66	32
Female					
Pretest	4.80	4.76	30	1.31	41
Posttest	9.56			3.90	41

Table 3

Summary Table of Residualized Gain Score Means

and Standard Deviations for Training and Sex

Source	Mean[a] $\bar{X}_{2.1}$	Standard Deviation
Reframing Training		
Training	2.67	2.92
Non-Training	-2.74	2.43
Sex		
Male	-.63	3.65
Female	.49	3.91

[a]The means represented here are those calculated from the residualized gain scores. Residualized gain scores are standardized.

Notes

[1]Pettegrew's treatment of reframing represents a modest departure from the precise and conventional meaning of the term "reframe." In a therapeutic context to "reframe" entails generating a new frame that changes the meaning of an a priori frame without changing the facts of the situation. Typically, a therapist "reframes" when the client is "stuck" in an existing frame. If one refuses to accept the limited or undesirable alternatives implicit in an offered message, one's initial frame can facilitate avoiding the dilemma. Avoiding the presumed dilemma via refusing the accept or "buy into" the implicitly suggested frame is considered a kind of reframing, even though such set breaking refusal may constitute an initial frame rather than a reframe.

[2]The remaining Double Bind Games are available upon request to the junior author.

[3]The percentage for all four pretest games is slightly increased over those for the Zen Master alone because the percentage was based on the operationalization of the concept "low level reframer." Low level reframers were defined as individuals who scored six or less on the DBG pretest. An absolute non-reframer, i.e., who who accepts the limiting frame posed by the injunction, would have a pretest score of four.

[4]A ninth Double Bind Game, Flowers, was included in this analysis. The Flowers vignette was used for training the raters; it was not used in the experiment.

[5]The predicted posttest score can be stated as follows:

$$X_2 = a + b_{x_2x_1} (X_1)$$

where a is the intercept constant and $b_{x_2x_1}$ is the slope. Thus, the residualized gain score ($X_{2.1}$) is defined as follows:

$$X_{2.1} = X_2 - \hat{X}_2$$

References

Adkins, W. Life skills education for adult learners. Adult Leadership, 1973, 6, 1-7.

Authier, J. The psychoeducation mode: Definition, contemporary roots and content. Canadian Counsellor, 1977, 12, 15-22.

Authier, J., & Fix, A. J. A step-group therapy program based on levels of interpersonal communication. Small Group Behavior, 1977, 8, 101-107.

Authier, J., Gustafson, K., Guerney, B., & Kasdorf, J. A. The psychological practitioner as a teacher: A theoretical-historical and practical review. The Counseling Psychologist, 1975, 5, 31-49.

Bateson, G., Jackson, D. D., Haley, J., & Weakland, J. H. Toward a theory of schizophrenia. In C. E. Sluzki & D. C. Ransom (Eds.), Doublebind: The foundation of the communicational approach to the family. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1976.

Berger, C., & Gold, D. Do sex differences in problem-solving still exist? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1979, 5, 109-113.

Bohrnstedt, G. W. Observations on the measurement of change. In E. F. Borgata (Ed.), Sociological methodology 1969. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Brown, S. D. Self-control skills training. Professional Psychology, 1975, 6, 319-330.

Brown, S. D. Coping skills training: An evaluation of a psycho-educational program in a community mental health setting. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1980, 27, 340-345.

Carkhuff, R. R. Training as a preferred mode of treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 123-131.

Dunlap, K. A revision of the fundamental law of habit formation. Science, 1928, 67, 360-362.

Dunlap, K. The technique of negative practice. American Journal of Psychology, 1942, 55, 270.

D'Zurilla, J. J., & Goldfried, M. R. Problem solving and behavior modification. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 78, 107-127.

Erickson, M. H., & Rossi, E. L. Varieties of double bind. American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis, 1975, 17, 143-157.

Feldman, L. B. Process of change in family therapy. Journal of Family Counseling, 1976, 4, 14-22.

Frankl, V. E. Paradoxical intention: A logotherapeutic technique. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1960, 14, 520-535.

Frankl, V. E. Paradoxical intention and dereflection: Two logotherapeutic techniques. In S. Arieti & G. Chrzanowski (Eds.), New dimensions in psychiatry: A new world view. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Glasgow, R. E., & Rosen, G. M. Behavioral bibliotherapy: A review of self-help behavior therapy manuals. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 1-23.

Gold, D., & Berger, C. Problem-solving performance of young boys and girls as a function of task appropriateness and sex identity. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, 183-193.

Guerney, B. Relationship enhancement: Skill-training programs for therapy, problem prevention and enrichment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Guerney, B. The great potential of an educational skill-training model in problem prevention. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1979, 8, 84-86.

Guetzkow, H. An analysis of the operation of set in problem-solving behavior. Journal of General Psychology, 1951, 45, 219-244.

Haley, J. Strategies of psychotherapy. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1963.

Holsti, O. R. Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley Publishers, 1969.

Ivey, A. E. Media therapy: Educational change planning for psychiatric patients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 338-343.

Ivey, A. E. The clinician as a teacher of interpersonal skills: Let's give away what we've got. The Clinical Psychologist, 1974, 27, 15-22.

Jackson, D. D. Interactional psychotherapy. In M. L. Stein (Ed.), Contemporary psychotherapies. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1962.

Jackson, D. D., & Weakland, J. H. Conjoint family therapy: Some considerations on theory, technique, and results. Psychiatry, 1961, 24, 30-45 (Supplement).

Kirk, R. E. Experimental design procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1968.

Luchin, A. S. Mechanization in problem-solving--the effect of Einstellung. Psychological Monographs, 1942, 54, (No. 6).

Miller, G. Psychology as a means of promoting human welfare. American Psychologist, 1969, 24, 1063-1065.

Mozdzierz, G. J., Macchitelli, F. J., & Lisiecki, J. The paradox in psychotherapy: An Adlerian perspective. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1976, 32, 169-184.

Nakamura, C. Y. Conformity and problem-solving. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 315-320.

Pettegrew, L. S. The paradox game: Identifying and overcoming untenable interactions. Simulation and Games: An International Journal of Theory, Design, and Research, 1979, 10, 359-383.

Pierce, R. M., & Drasgow, J. Teaching facilitative interpersonal functioning to psychiatric inpatients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 295-298.

Rosen, J. N. Direct analysis. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1953.

Schinke, S. P., Gilchrist, L. D., Smith, T. E., & Wong, S. E. Group interpersonal training in a natural setting: An experimental study. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1979, 17, 149-154.

Scott, W. A. Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1955, 19, 321-325.

Vitalo, R. L. Teaching improved interpersonal functioning as a preferred mode of treatment. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1971, 27, 166-171.

Watzlawick, P. The language of change: Elements of therapeutic communication. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. Pragmatics of communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies and paradoxes. New York: Norton, Inc., 1967.

Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J., & Fisch, R. Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution. New York: W. W. Norton, 1974.

Whiting, G. C. How does communication interface with change? Communication Research, 1976, 3, 191-212.